



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Points of Contrast.*

1. By comparing these tables we discover that while Amicis elides in 222 cases out of the 255 observed or in 87 per cent of the whole number, Barrili elides in only 80 cases out of 239 or in less than 34 per cent of the whole number observed.

2. Only in the case of *ne* does the number of elisions with Amicis fall below 80 per cent, while with Barrili it is only in the case of *la* that the number of elisions exceeds 40 per cent.

3. Amicis *always* elides the *i* of *vi* before *essere* and *avere*: Barrili *never* does in the work studied.

4. In the work of Amicis we find the *i* of *di* most frequently elided before *un*, *una*, *uno*; in the novel of Barrili it is most rarely elided in such cases.

5. In *Alberto* the *i* of *si* is elided in 60 cases out of 67, while in *Una Notte Bizzarra* such elision takes place in only 11 cases out of 28.

6. Amicis elides the *o* of *lo* in 17 out of 20 cases, while Barrili elides it only 7 times out of 20.

7. With Amicis elisions in *mi*, *ti*, *vi*, *ci* are almost general, while with Barrili they occur in only about 25 per cent of the cases.

8. Elisions before other words than *essere* and *avere* are most common in *Alberto* before *a* and *u*, but in *Una Notte Bizzarra* they are least common before these vowels.

*Points of Resemblance.*

1. Both authors regularly elide the final vowel in the words under consideration when the following word begins with a corresponding vowel; that is, they write *l'ho* for *lo ho*, *l'ha* for *la ha*, *s'intende* for *si intende*, etc.,. The *Alberto* offers only one exception to this rule and the other romance only three.

2. With both authors elisions are most common before *essere*, where they are of general occurrence and comprise more than 25 per cent of the whole number of elisions found in both romances.

3. The *a* of *la* is regularly elided in both works.

4. We find in both authors cases of elision before each of the vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, a fact which shows that while elision may be in-

fluenced by the character of the following vowel it is in no wise dependent on it.

5. Neither of the two authors elides the vowel of the pronouns *li* and *le*, and only rarely does either of them elide the *e* of *che*. When *che* is used as the subject of a sentence, even Amicis elides the *e* in only one or two cases in the whole work.

Although other permissible, but not required, elisions (besides those mentioned in the tables), are found, they are not apparently sufficiently common to authorize their general practice by the student of Italian; though he may practice elision for all the words to which I have called special attention. In view of the fact that elisions are so general in spoken Italian, and in the written language are supported by the highest authority, it would seem advisable for the learner to elide the vowels wherever permissible in the words to which I have referred as he will find it more natural to write *d'avere* than *di avere*, *l'ha* than *lo ha*, *m'aveva* than *mi aveva*, etc., since he is already accustomed probably to write in French: *d'avoir*, *l'a*, *m'avait*, etc.

J. CHARLES WALKER.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

*SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.*

*Wallenstein.* Ein dramatisches Gedicht von Schiller. With an introduction and notes by W. H. CARRUTH, Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1894. 8vo, lxxix, 58, 130, 200, etc.

*Wallenstein.* Ein Trauerspiel von Friedrich Schiller. Edited (with introduction, English notes, and an appendix) by KARL BREUL, M. A., Ph. D. 1. Wallensteins Lager. Die Piccolomini. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1894. 8vo, lvi, 299.

IN MOD. LANG. NOTES of March 1892, Professor Brandt emphasized the need of editions of the complete *Faust* and of *Wallenstein*. Since then Professor Thomas has published his excellent edition of the First Part of *Faust*, promising us a similar edition of the Second Part, and during the past year we have received two editions of *Wallenstein*, while a third one, to be published by Messrs. Ginn &

Co., is in course of preparation. Some good editions of Lessing's *Nathan* have been accessible for some time, and thus our American colleges will soon be able to study to full advantage these three masterpieces of German dramatic art, which are also the greatest works of the three foremost figures in German literature.

Of the two new editions of *Wallenstein*, the one by Dr. Breul is as yet incomplete. The second volume has not been published up to the time of this writing and, for that reason, a detailed review of the work is postponed for the present. The first volume before us contains a general introduction (pp. xi-lvi), the text of the *Lager* and *Die Piccolomini*, the notes on these (pp. 169-289), an appendix, and two very useful indexes to the notes. The introduction is composed of a brief life of Schiller (pp. xi-xx), a discussion of the metre (pp. xx-xl), an account of the genesis of the drama (pp. xl-xlvi), and the inevitable 'argument' (pp. xlvi-lvi). There is no historical introduction, and from the wording of the preface it remains doubtful whether or not the second volume will remove this serious omission. The text is excellently printed and practically free from all typographical errors. The notes, extending over two hundred pages of fine print, exhibit all the strong and weak points of the editor's well-known manner, and will be of interest and value to most teachers. The whole book is a worthy match for the previous excellent editions which Dr. Breul has prepared for the Pitt Press Series, and though we may differ from the editor with regard to what constitutes the most desirable edition of a classic German drama, we must admit that his work is always refreshing for its precision, scholarliness and conscientious accuracy. The editor has evidently spared neither time nor labor to do well that which he considers best to do.

The other edition of *Wallenstein*, which lies complete before us in an attractive volume of a little over five hundred pages, is in many respects very different from Dr. Breul's book.

The Introduction (pp. iii-lxxxi) contains no account of the poet's life, which seems entirely proper with a play like *Wallenstein*. There are only a few remarks on the metre, while its

*pièce de résistance* is a very readable chapter of some fifty pages that gives everything "needful for the historical orientation of the student." Besides, there is a chapter on the genesis and one on the significance of the drama, and an alphabetic list of persons. Both the Introduction and the preceding 'Biographical Suggestions' seem to indicate that the editor has been especially interested in the historical bearings of the drama. It cannot be denied, though, that he has yielded too exclusively to this personal preference, while he has not used to full advantage the various literary commentaries and editions. In his Biographical Suggestions he mentions nine historical works—all in German except one—but no other commentaries than that of Düntzer, and no other editions except those with English notes by Buchheim, Cotterill, and Hart. This seems out of all proportion, since *Wallenstein* is above all a work of art for the full comprehension of which it is not necessary to go deeply into the details of historical research. Some of the best commentaries on the drama as such would be of far greater value to the teacher for whom the "Biographical Suggestions" evidently are intended. If he is recommended to study Murr, Herchenhahn, Gädecke and other historical writers, his attention should still more be called to editions like those of Vollmer or Funke, and to commentaries like those of Bellermann, Werder and others. Also the exclusive mention of Palleske and Boyesen as biographers of Schiller must cause some astonishment. For if these Biographical Suggestions are to contain only a few books, which seems very commendable, it is so much the more the editor's duty carefully to select the most important and most useful works. Also in other respects these suggestions do not make an impression of care and accuracy. Of Buchheim's book a sixth edition appeared in 1884; of Ranke's work a fourth edition in 1880.

The historical introduction contains the following chapters: i. The Thirty Years' War. ii. The Catastrophe. iii. *Wallenstein*. iv. Identification of Characters. This is the most valuable part of the book and it will doubtless well serve its purpose. On p. vii the wording of "the Calvinists, called the 'Re-

formed 'faith' needs to be changed. On p. xiii "Capo d'Armada" should be explained. On p. xvii the student will probably not know what is meant by the "Mantuan succession." On p. xxvi it is not clear how Bernhard in the fall of 1633 by a movement "toward the north-east" could "enter the gap" between Wallenstein's army "in Lusatia" and that of Alt-ringer "in the extreme southwestern part of Germany." Bernhard, at that time, was near Ingolstadt and, consequently, was already between the two Imperial armies. He had "entered the gap" in the spring of that year by a movement southward from Würzburg towards Donauwörth. On pp. xxi and xxiv the statements with reference to the command of the army of the League should be more explicit, as on the whole the important relations between Wallenstein and the League on the one hand, and between the League and the Emperor on the other, might have been set forth more clearly. On p. l it is difficult to see how it can be said of Schiller's Wallenstein that "he confesses and is penitent." Misprints in this part of the book occur on p. iii, 20 (read: drama), on p. xxix, 9 (read: materials), on p. xl, 18 (read: glaubwürdigen), on p. lii, 6 (read: Gallas).

The fifth chapter of the introduction deals with the genesis of the drama and, while satisfactory on the whole, it contains various signs of lack of carefulness. *Fiesco* appeared in 1783, not 1784. On p. lv we find the title *Die Geschichte des niederländischen Abfalls*. Work on *Die Neue Thalia* could not influence Schiller in 1794, since the publication had been discontinued in 1793. *Maria Stuart* appeared in 1801, not 1800; *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* in 1802, not 1801.

In the brief sixth chapter on The Significance of the Drama the "tragical motive in Wallenstein" is too exclusively discussed.

In the seventh chapter the metre is briefly discussed. The few statements on the blankverse seem quite sufficient, because the student of *Wallenstein* will probably not read German blankverse for the first time. The sixteen lines on the *Knittelverse* of the *Lager*, however, can hardly suffice to give the student a correct idea of this irregular metre which he has probably never met before. At least

a few practical remarks about the reading of the verses would be desirable.

The alphabetic List of Persons is certainly welcome for reference in a play abounding in historical characters. In most instances it is, however, quite superfluous to enumerate by act and scene or page and line how often a person appears in the play or is in any manner referred to. Moreover, none but historical persons should be given in the list; the reason for mentioning the *Gefreiter*, the *Kammerfrau* and others is somewhat puzzling. There are some inconsistencies in the spelling of names; the list gives only *Dubald* (*Duwall*), *Liechtenstein*, *Palffy*, while the text has *Dubald*, *Lichtenstein*, *Palffy*. *Rheingraf* is in the wrong place alphabetically. *Pyrrhus* and *Attila* are mentioned; if so, why not *Ahab* and *Jerobeam*? Omitted are also *Charles of Bourbon* and *Charles V*. Much to be regretted is the exclusion of names of places. The list would be much more useful if it were a general list of proper names. By omitting from the list what is unnecessary, the names of places could be added without requiring any additional space. Words like *Saal*, *Halberstadt*, *Olmütz*, *Burgau* and many others which are not explained in the notes, will be troublesome to the student who will not know whether he can find them on the map or not.

The Text is far from being satisfactory, and it seems that both the editor and the publishers are to be held responsible for this fact. Old and worn plates have been used; as a consequence, letters and punctuation, especially at the beginnings and ends of lines, are often illegible or even invisible. Besides, there is a large number of typographical errors which should have been carefully corrected even if old plates were used. The very least we are entitled to expect of a school edition of a classic is a fairly correct text. It is also a grave drawback to the class use of the book that the lines of the text are not numbered, while the reference in the notes are necessarily to page and line. It would require too much space to give an approximately complete list of the misprints noticed in the use of the book. Only the following shall be mentioned. PROLOG: 4, 23 *die* should be spaced; 4, 27

read *mächtig*; 7, 16 *er* should be spaced. LAGER: 35, 8 read *Eisenfresser*; 37, 10 read *Spitzbub*; 55, 15 read *Sprecher*; 57, 21 read *schier*?.—PICCOLOMINI: 8, 11 read *Dass*; 55, 2 read *Ihren* (cf. 50, 14); 89, 9 read *der*; 121, 17 read *wissen*?; 126, 9 read *viel*?.—TOD: 33, 1 read *auf- und abgegangen* (cf. pp. 10 and 58); 65, 9 read *mündig* (else there should be a note); 77, 6 read *Was!*; 98, 1 read *glauben's*; 124, 14 read *Sie*; 131, 9 read *gekommen*; 140, 20 read *Säh'*; 145, 2 read *Er*; 157, 14 read *Ihrer*; 178, 19 read *dass*.—In the note on Picc. 7, 19 read *Greif zu*; in the note on Picc. 126, 12 read *nacher*; in the note on Tod 58, 3 read 196, ll. 3-5; in the note on Tod 67, 10 read 19; in the note on Tod 83 insert 12 before *abschicken*; in the note on Tod 124, 14 read *Laren*; in the note on Tod 137, 1 read 1633-34; in the note on Tod 165, 5 read *der*.

The punctuation throughout the text is especially faulty. The orthography is avowedly modernized (even *Kriegsfuri* in Lager 31, 15 is changed to *Kriegsfurie*), and yet we find forms like *wächst* with round *s*, *lügenen*, *ächt*, *ärnten* and others that must necessarily be confusing to the student. There is also repeated inconsistency in the use of C and K in words like *Kürassier*, *Kornet*, *Kourier* and others. In this connection it may be mentioned that it seems very desirable that in our editions of classic texts there should be uniformity with reference to the use of capitals in *er* and *ihr* when used as pronouns of address of the second person singular. Prof. Carruth prints *Er* and *ihr*; Dr. Breul *er* and *Ihr*; Professor Buchheim *Er* and *Ihr*; the Cotta editions and, probably, Schiller himself, *er* and *ihr*. Thus we have all possible variety, which is at times quite confusing. It would seem that if we change at all, none but practical consideration should guide us in this matter and that on that account it would be most desirable to follow Professor Buchheim's example and write *Er* (to distinguish it from the third pers. sing.) and *Ihr* (to distinguish it from the second person plural).

The Notes on the entire drama fill forty-seven pages, and it is evident that it has been the commendable desire of the editor to restrict the notes so as not to make the whole book inconveniently large. The question is

only whether he has not gone too far in what is, on the whole, the right direction. It would seem that Dr. Breul, in his edition, has often been too prolix in his notes. Prof. Carruth, to my mind, has no less often been too brief, or has omitted altogether to call attention to those unusual or irregular forms and constructions which in *Wallenstein*, and especially in the *Lager*, are more frequent than in the others of Schiller's dramas that are generally read in our colleges. And yet there was no need for such excessive limitation, since the whole volume contains about five hundred pages, so that some twenty or thirty additional pages of notes would not have materially affected the size and cost of the book, while they would have greatly enhanced its value as a college text-book. The following expressions, for example, required a note, or at least a fuller note than they received: *thät* in Lager 10, 16 (the note does not explain the form); *für* in Lager 10, 13, etc.; *bass* in Lager 29, 17; *Zwiebel* as a masc. in Lager 32, 32; *selbst* in Lager 48, 4; *also* in Lager 51, 25; *schwüurig* in Picc. 19, 12 (Breul prints *schwierig*; but even then the meaning is not 'difficult of approach', but 'in Gährung'; cf. Sanders s. v. *schwierig*); *Wissenschaft* in Picc. 20, 1; *eilf* in Picc. 32, 5; *Böheim* in Picc. 51, 2; *sonsten* in Picc. 60, 12; *weil* in Picc. 66, 8; *ob* in Picc. 70, 21; *auf* in Picc. 99, 11; *stündest* in Picc. 119, 17; *darfst* (=bedarfst) in Tod 76, 4; *die hohlen Läger* in Tod 94, 17. A great many more instances could be quoted, but these will suffice to justify our criticism. To let such forms and constructions pass unnoticed is unpedagogic, in as far as it will necessarily produce carelessness on the part of the student who is led to believe that an additional ending or some other change of form or word cuts no figure and is not worthy of his careful observation. Besides, the general character of Prof. Carruth's annotation clearly shows that he has not written his edition for very advanced students, who could possibly be supposed to be familiar with most of such archaic or unusual forms.

Again, there are quite a number of other instances where brief notes seem necessary to explain the thought of the passage. No doubt in such cases different annotators will always differ concerning the extent of required anno-

tation. Yet the shade of thought expressed in a passage often causes more difficulty to the student than the forms or constructions involved, and to my mind it is to be regretted that both Prof. Carruth and Dr. Breul have almost entirely confined themselves to notes on grammatical and historical points. The thought, bearing, force, and artistic value of certain passages or whole scenes should at least occasionally be explained and impressed upon our students. A literary masterpiece like *Wallenstein* seems imperatively to demand such treatment. To leave this part of the interpretation entirely to the teacher is certainly not always the wisest thing the editor can do, if he is interested in insuring a full appreciation of the work he edits. As specimens of passages that for some such reason seem to require fuller interpretation than they have received at the hands of Prof. Carruth, we may mention: PROLOG 7, 11-12; 8, 14-16; LAGER 37, 1; PICC. 24, 1; 28, 25; 40, 13; 77, 9; 90, 7-12; 107, 5; TOD 33, 7; 39, 18-20. On the other hand, in a few instances, as in LAGER 35, 8, the notes given contain unnecessary details, although we admit that such is very rarely the case.

We also find that the commendable desire of being brief has repeatedly induced the editor merely to give a translation where the difficulty involved should be, however briefly, explained; cf., for example, PICC. 32, 16 (the translation given will induce the student to mistake *bei* for English 'by' with the passive); 100, 26; 102, 4.

Some of the notes that are common to both editions are interesting inasmuch as they represent differences of opinion. PROLOG 4, 7 Prof. Carruth, following Düntzer, refers the much discussed *Kreis* to the auditorium, while Dr. Breul less acceptably interprets it as 'circle of spectators.' In either case, however, *Bühne* is not in apposition to *Kreis* and the comma after *Bühne* should be omitted.—PROLOG 8,4 Prof. Carruth refers *den ungewöhnten Tönen* to the use of the metre, Dr. Breul to the subject of the play. Dr. Breul's interpretation is new, but he supports it not successfully.—PROLOG 8,15 Prof. Carruth explains *ihren Schein* as referring to *Täuschung*, while Dr. Breul seems to give to *Schein* the mean-

ing of 'ästhetischer Schein,' referring *ihren* grammatically to *Muse* or *Kunst*.

A few more instances of difference of opinion will be mentioned in the following comments on some of Prof. Carruth's notes. PICC. 14, 6. *Schafe* does not refer to the courtiers; but to the citizens in general, particularly to the Bohemians.—PICC. 22, 9. It is difficult to take the proposed historical parallel seriously. The editor himself cannot tell us who is meant by Octavius, and we can surely not consider Questenberg unpolitic enough to suggest to Max the rôle of Brutus. The epithets *heilbringend* and *vorbedeutungsvoll* very naturally refer to the fame and renown attaching to the names of the two men themselves.—PICC. 51, 29. The translation gives to the line a cruel meaning which is almost the opposite of what it really expresses. Dr. Breul's interpretation is correct and his quotation from 'Der Taucher' very appropriate.—PICC. 52, 9. *Ruhm* seems to refer to Gustavus' reputation of being invincible (cf. 51, 9), although as a matter of fact he was not really defeated at Nuremberg.—PICC. 57, 3. This note should be on 33,13.—PICC. 78,15. *Gitschin* can surely not be called "a large city."—PICC. 91, 9. *Ich gebe* cannot be understood; rather *Es lebe*.—PICC. 102,9. This note should be on 99, 11 with a reference to Lager 28, 13.—PICC. 110, 6. The note, though not wrong, is misleading, since the uncontracted form has nothing to do with the causative meaning of the verb.—PICC. 112, 7. This *e* is generally ascribed to the influence of the weak verbs; see Paul, 2. ed., p. 61 and Weinhold, 2. ed., p. 399.—PICC. 121, 10-13. The passage would lose much of its force if we referred *Schritt* to *Rache*. Wallenstein's own act must cause his perdition; cf. Bellermann ii, 160.—TOD 22, 10. This note should be on 20, 6.—TOD 23, 1. If anything were to be supplied, it would be *da*; but *nun* itself is used as a causal conjunction. The proposed insertion of *dass* would entirely destroy the sense of the line.—TOD 28, 21. A note should call attention to the "technical" meaning of *neuen Menschen*=homines novi.—TOD 28, 23. *Aufwand* is not 'prodigality,' but 'effort,' 'exertion;' *mit gleichem Aufwand*= 'equally easily.'—TOD 31, 1. *Dies Geschlecht* does not mean 'present humanity,' but

'this race (of ours),' i. e. mankind in general.—TOD 57, 9. *Sie macht die Kränkung gut* does not seem to me "auffallend" as Düntzer calls it, whom Prof. Carruth follows. Octavio says that the Emperor does not only forgive Buttler's intended desertion (p. 53), but even "makes good the wrong" previously done Buttler. For by confirming his appointment as Major General, the Emperor confers upon Buttler an honor similar to the one refused before.—TOD 63, 1. There is not so much of a "sudden change of tone" as Prof. Carruth seems to think, especially if we take *deiner=des Namens, den du führst* (p. 62, 11).—TOD 78, 13. *Entdeck's* is evidently a mistake for *Entdeck's* since the countess invariably addresses Wallenstein with *du*. Kurz, Birlinger, and Buchheim print *Entdeck's*.—TOD 79, 6. The proposed change of reading "which seems inevitable" to the editor, is as arbitrary as unnecessary. The line as Schiller wrote it is beyond reproach, since in the context it cannot possibly be misconstrued. No wonder that "all texts have" the unchanged reading.—TOD 84, 26. Again the proposed change is uncalled for. Instead of improving the passage it detracts materially from its force. The poet very happily implies that the *Gedankenlosen* have no *Busen*, that is "no heart" (l. 23): *Nichts fällt (bei den Gedankenlosen) in eines Busens stillen Grund (wie es wohl bei tieferführenden Naturen der Fall ist)*.—TOD 144, 15. It cannot be denied that the line is troublesome; but Prof. Carruth's interpretation is not convincing. The comparison between Wallenstein and Archimedes may be far-fetched and the parallel but faint. But a comparison between Wallenstein and Max is still less plausible since the causes leading to their respective deaths are entirely different. Prof. Carruth's chief objection is to *jener dort*. But could *dort* not be taken to modify the following *in seinem Zirkel*, the *seinem* referring to *jener*, not to *er* (Wallenstein)? 'He will fall like that other one (who fell) yonder in the midst of his circles.'—TOD 166, 10. According to Düntzer and others *krumm* does not mean 'sway-backed' but 'spavined.'—TOD 174, 7. *Gut* modifying *Glück* was not "unusual" in Schiller's time, in fact is not so now; cf. *auf gut Glück*. See Sanders s.v. *Glück*.

The edition contains a good map, a facsimile of the 'revers,' and a few well-executed historical portraits, all of which additions are well-adapted to stimulate interest in the drama and its historical background.

On the whole, however, the entire book shows too much the lack of a finishing hand, of a careful final redaction. Traces of hasty work are too frequent, even for a first edition. If, as we learn, a second edition may be published before long, we have a right to expect at least a correct text with lines numbered, while we hope for a carefully revised and somewhat more liberal body of notes. As the book is now, notwithstanding its various good features, which we cheerfully acknowledge, it cannot be called an adequate edition of one of the greatest masterpieces of German literature, and we still have reason to look forward with expectation to the edition of *Wallenstein* announced by Messrs. Ginn & Co.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Goethe* von RICHARD M. MEYER, Preisgekrönte Arbeit. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co., 8vo, pp. 600, 1895.

THE publishing house of Hofmann & Co. offered July 15, 1891, a prize of three thousand marks for the best Goethe biography, and this prize was awarded Oct. 1, 1893, to Dr. Richard M. Meyer, Privatdozent in the University of Berlin. The work is a book of about 600 octavo pages, well printed and aims to treat chronologically Goethe's life and works. In view of the enormous critical and biographical work which is being done in Germany on Goethe, it is highly desirable that a biography should appear from time to time which should present to the public Goethe the man and the poet in the light of the most accurate thought of the period. Such is evidently Dr. Meyer's intention. He aims to popularize the most fruitful investigations which have appeared on Goethe in recent years and thus to correct the many false views and impressions of the poet current in Germany. The author complains that Goethe is not sufficiently read in Germany and hopes